

REVIEW FOR APPLICABILITY OF/COMPLIANCE WITH ORDINANCES/POLICIES

FOR PURPOSES OF CONSIDERATION OF
NORDAHL ROAD TENTATIVE MAP; PDS2015-TM-5602; PDS2015-ER-15-08-008

May 3, 2018

I. HABITAT LOSS PERMIT ORDINANCE – Does the proposed project conform to the Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance findings?

YES
☐

NO
☐

NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT
☒

Discussion:

While the proposed project and off-site improvements are located outside of the boundaries of the Multiple Species Conservation Program, the project site and locations of any off-site improvements do not contain habitats subject to the Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance. Therefore, conformance to the Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance findings is not required.

II. MSCP/BMO - Does the proposed project conform to the Multiple Species Conservation Program and Biological Mitigation Ordinance?

YES
☐

NO
☐

NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT
☒

Discussion:

The proposed project and any off-site improvements related to the proposed project are located outside of the boundaries of the Multiple Species Conservation Program. Therefore, conformance with the Multiple Species Conservation Program and the Biological Mitigation Ordinance is not required.

III. GROUNDWATER ORDINANCE - Does the project comply with the requirements of the San Diego County Groundwater Ordinance?

YES
☐

NO
☐

NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT
☒

The project will obtain potable water from the Vista Irrigation District that obtains water from surface reservoirs and/or other imported sources. The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation or domestic supply.

IV. RESOURCE PROTECTION ORDINANCE - Does the project comply with:

The wetland and wetland buffer regulations (Sections 86.604(a) and (b)) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT <input type="checkbox"/>
The Floodways and Floodplain Fringe section (Sections 86.604(c) and (d)) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT <input type="checkbox"/>
The Steep Slope section (Section 86.604(e))?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT <input type="checkbox"/>
The Sensitive Habitat Lands section (Section 86.604(f)) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT <input type="checkbox"/>
The Significant Prehistoric and Historic Sites section (Section 86.604(g)) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT <input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

Wetland and Wetland Buffers:

The site contains no wetland habitats as defined by the San Diego County Resource Protection Ordinance. The site does not have a substratum of predominately undrained hydric soils, the land does not support, even periodically, hydric plants, nor does the site have a substratum that is non-soil and is saturated with water or covered by water at some time during the growing season of each year. Therefore, it has been found that the proposed project complies with Sections 86.604(a) and (b) of the Resource Protection Ordinance.

Floodways and Floodplain Fringe:

The project is not located near any floodway or floodplain fringe area as defined in the resource protection ordinance, nor is it near a watercourse plotted on any official County floodway or floodplain map. Therefore, it has been found that the proposed project complies with Sections 86.604(c) and (d) of the Resource Protection Ordinance.

Steep Slopes:

Slopes with a gradient of 25 percent or greater and 50 feet or higher in vertical height are required to be placed in open space easements by the San Diego County RPO. There are no steep slopes on the property. Therefore, it has been found that the proposed project complies with Sections 86.604(e) of the RPO.

Sensitive Habitats:

Sensitive habitat lands include unique vegetation communities and/or habitat that is either necessary to support a viable population of sensitive species, is critical to the proper functioning of a balanced natural ecosystem, or which serves as a functioning wildlife corridor. No sensitive habitat lands were identified on the site as determined on a site

visit conducted by Vanessa Toscano on June 10, 2015. Therefore, it has been found that the proposed project complies with Section 86.604(f) of the RPO.

Significant Prehistoric and Historic Sites:

A cultural resources study titled "Cultural Resource Survey, Test, and Evaluation of the Nordahl Tentative Map 5602 Project, San Marcos, San Diego County, California (PDS2015-TM-5602)" was completed by County-approved archaeologist/historian, Andrew Pignuolo (November 2017). Two historic-period resources (P-37-035639 and P-37-035641) and one prehistoric archaeological resource (CA-SDI-22192) were identified. Testing and evaluation determined that the three resources are not significant. Therefore, the project complies with the RPO.

V. STORMWATER ORDINANCE (WPO) - Does the project comply with the County of San Diego Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO)?

YES
☒

NO
☐

NOT APPLICABLE
☐

Discussion:

The project Storm Water Quality Management Plan and Hydromodification Management Study has/have been reviewed and are found to be complete and in compliance with the WPO.

VI. NOISE ORDINANCE – Does the project comply with the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan and the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance?

YES
☒

NO
☐

NOT APPLICABLE
☐

Discussion:

The project is a Tentative Map for 15 residential lots. The proposed residences are subject to the County Noise Element. All group usable and private outdoor areas are subject to exterior 60 dBA CNEL for this type of single family lots development pursuant to the County Noise Element. The proposed Lot 1 would be exposed to future traffic noise as high as 61 dBA CNEL. All other lots would be exposed to levels of 60 dBA CNEL and below demonstrating conformance to the Noise Element requirements. Lot 1 would require a noise measure to reduce levels to less than significant. A seven-foot high sound barrier was modeled and demonstrated that Lot 1 could be reduced to levels of 60 dBA CNEL and below with incorporation of this noise measure. At the time of building permit application, an alternate mitigation measure may be considered, including the use of architectural features as noise mitigation or the combination of the residential structure and a free standing sound wall. This alternate noise measure may be considered upon review and approval of a noise report prior to issuance of building permits for Lot 1. Additionally, the Tentative Map will be conditioned to grant a Noise Restriction Easement over Lots 1, 2, 14, and 15 to ensure interior noise levels of 45 dBA CNEL can be met and

that noise measures for Lot 1 have been implemented accordingly. These conditions would satisfy the Noise Element requirement for noise sensitive outdoor areas associated with the project.

Temporary construction noise associated with grading is subject to a 75 dBA eight hour average sound level limit at occupied property lines. Project related grading construction to prepare the site was assessed and demonstrated levels would not exceed the County construction noise requirements. The project will not involve impulsive type of construction activities. No drilling and no blasting is anticipated. No materials processing is proposed on site. General good practice measures would be conditioned as part of the Tentative Parcel Map decision and would ensure construction noise levels comply with Section 36.409 of the County Noise Ordinance. Therefore, temporary construction equipment activities would comply with the 75 dBA eight hour average pursuant to the County Noise Ordinance, Section 36.408 & 36.409.